

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/537,670	06/06/2005	Franciscus Paulus Maria Budzelaar	NL02 1239 US	5151		
24737 7	7590 08/14/2006	EXAMINER				
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			JEAN PIERI	JEAN PIERRE, PEGUY		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2819			
			DATE MAILED: 08/14/200	DATE MAILED: 08/14/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/537,67	o o	BUDZELAAR, PAULUS				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Peguy Jea		2819				
The Period for Re	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)⊠ Resi	consive to communication(s) filed on	6/23/2006						
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
/								
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
		lication						
	Claim(s) <u>15-28</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
· —								
	Claim(s) <u>15-28</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
	n(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election r	aguiromont					
0)∐ Claii	in(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election n	equirement.					
Application P	apers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
Attachment(s)	<b>6</b>			(070 4/2)				
	eferences Cited (PTO-892) aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9	48)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		•			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date				nal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2819

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 15-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 15, the term "...converter apparatuses Z1, Z2, ...Zk" makes the claim confusing. It is not clear what Z1...Zk represents. Do Z1..Zk represent k-flash analog to digital converter that is adapted to receive a respective stepped voltage or the comparators of the flash converters? Please clarify. Same rejection for claim 22. In claim 18, the difference between "the converter apparatus' recited in line 2 and "the A/D converter" on the same line is not well established. In addition, it is not clear whether the term "the A/D converters" recited in line 3 represent the converters recited in line 2. Please clarify. Same rejection for claim 25.

Claims 19 and 26, line 2 the term "the relative error" lacks antecedent basis. In addition, both claims recite the word "pieces" that make them broad. For instance, limitation in line 3 such as "VIN having k pieces" is broad and indefinite. Please clarify.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,670

Art Unit: 2819

3. Claims 15-17 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yee (USP 5,309,157).

Page 3

As per claims 15 and 22 Yee discloses in Figure 13, k flash analog to digital converters (430, 432) each flash converter generates multiple bit digital output (b2, b3) and (b0, b1). The analog input of the converter is compared to reference voltage stepsize as shown in Figure 16 to generate the final digital output which is supposedly an accurate representation of the analog input signal (see also col. 14, lines 36-51). As per claims 16 and 23, Figure 13 of Yee shows that both converters output the same number of bits. As per claims 17 and 24, it is inherent that the number of bits of the converter might be designed to be different as long as the final digital output accurately represents the analog input signal.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 18-19 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. Claims 18-19 and 25-28 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
- 6. The prior art of record does not teach a converter system that comprises at least a first and a second analog to digital converter that are coupled in series with an arithmetic unit; the arithmetic unit receives the input voltage and is adapted to change the input voltage of the converter to be within a plurality of contiguous voltage subranges of the converters.

Art Unit: 2819

#### Conclusion

Page 4

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peguy JeanPierre whose telephone number is (571) 272-1803. The examiner fax phone number is (571) 273-1803.

Peguy JeanPierre

**Primary Examiner**